UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/590,590	05/07/2007	Swadeshmukul Santra	UF-420XC1	8520	
	7590 10/21/201 K LLOYD & SALIW		EXAMINER		
A PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION			SCHLIENTZ, LEAH H		
PO Box 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1618		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/21/2010	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

euspto@slspatents.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/590,590	SANTRA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Leah Schlientz	1618				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	L. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 Au</u>	iaust 2006					
	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan		secution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
closed in accordance with the practice under L.	parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 40	3 O. O . 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-12,14,15,18-21,23,25,29-36,38,		the application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		• •				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-12,14,15,18-21,23,25,29-36,38,</u>	39 41 51-53 are subject to restric	tion and/or election requirem	nent			
0/E3 Olaim(0) 112,1 12,1 11,10,10 21,20,20,20,20 00,00,0	<u>50, 11,01 00</u> are subject to restric	non ana/or olootion roquiron	ioni.			
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.					
TT) The patrol declaration is objected to by the Ex	animer. Note the attached Office	Action of ionin 1 TO-102.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documents						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •	<u> </u>				
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	•	d in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	of the certified copies not receive	d.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	te				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal Page 6) Other:	atent Application				
rapor noto man bate	o/					

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1, 2, 4-12, 14,15 and 51-53 are drawn to a multi-functional contrast agent comprising a CdS:Mn/ZnS core/shell quantum dot.

Group II, claim(s) 18-21, 23, 25, 29-36, 38, 39, drawn to a method for visualizing a target within an opaque medium comprising introducing a contrast agent comprising a CdS:Mn/ZnS core/shell quantum dot.

Group III, claim(s) 41, drawn to a mammalian cell containing a multi-functional contrast agent comprising a CdS:Mn/ZnS core/shell quantum dot.

The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

An international application should relate to only one invention or, if there is more than one invention, the inclusion of those inventions in one international application is only permitted if all inventions are so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (PCT Rule 13.1). With respect to a group of inventions claimed in an international application, unity of invention exists only when there is a technical

Art Unit: 1618

relationship among the claimed inventions involving one or more of the same or corresponding special technical features.

The expression "special technical features" is defined in PCT Rule 13.2 as meaning those technical features that define a contribution which each of the inventions, considered as a whole, makes over the prior art. The determination is made on the contents of the claims as interpreted in light of the description and drawings (if any). Whether or not any particular technical feature makes a "contribution" over the prior art, and therefore constitutes a "special technical feature", should be considered with respect to novelty and inventive step.

The common technical feature in all the groups is a CdS:Mn/ZnS core/shell quantum dot. This element cannot be a special technical feature under PCT Rule 13.2 because the element is shown in the prior art.

Yang teaches CdS:Mn/ZnS core/shell quantum dots in *Applied Physics Letters*, 2003, 82(12), p. 1965. As a result, no special technical features exist among the different groups because the invention in Group I fails to make a contribution over the prior art with respect to novelty or inventive step. In conclusion, there is lack of unity of inventions, and therefore restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/590,590 Page 4

Art Unit: 1618

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof.

Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case.

Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Notice of Potential Rejoinder

Application/Control Number: 10/590,590 Page 5

Art Unit: 1618

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Contact Information

Application/Control Number: 10/590,590 Page 6

Art Unit: 1618

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leah Schlientz whose telephone number is (571)272-9928. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday 9 AM-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Hartley can be reached on 571-272-0616. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael G. Hartley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618

LHS